

2000  
**Consumer Satisfaction**  
*for*  
**New Horizons Community Support Services**  
Community-based Services

Division of Comprehensive Psychiatric Services  
Missouri Department of Mental Health



Christine Rinck, Ph.D., Project Director, Consumer Satisfaction  
UMKC Institute for Human Development, a UAP  
Kansas City, Missouri

Gary Harbison, MA, DMH Outcomes Coordinator,  
Office of Quality Management

Christine Squibb, Director, Office of Consumer Affairs



*Thanks to the many people who completed the survey and to the staff of participating agencies. Thanks to the members of the Consumer Satisfaction Work Group, the Outcomes Work Group and the Performance Measurement Group.*

**August 2000**

# DMH Satisfaction Survey Results

## Consumer Satisfaction - 2000

Comprehensive Psychiatric Services

*Agency:* New Horizons Community Support Services

## Table of Contents

Section 1. Total Agency

Section 2. Total Columbia Facility

Section 3. Total Jefferson City Facility

# DMH Satisfaction Survey Results

## Consumer Satisfaction - 2000

### Comprehensive Psychiatric Services

**Agency:** New Horizons Community Support Services

## Demographics

		Total Served		Agency Survey Returns		
		State	Agency	Total Consumers	CPRC Adult	Non-CPRC Adult
<b>SEX</b>	Male	46.2%	43.2%	37.0%	36.5%	42.9%
	Female	53.8%	56.8%	63.0%	63.5%	57.1%
<b>RACE</b>	White	80.6%	89.5%	85.9%	84.7%	100.0%
	Black	17.0%	10.1%	10.9%	11.8%	0%
	Hispanic	.5%	0%	1.1%	1.2%	0%
	Native American	.3%	0%	1.1%	1.2%	0%
	Pacific Islander (a)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Other	1.6%	.3%	1.1%	1.2%	0%
<b>MEAN AGE</b>				45.56	45.48	46.57
	0-17	13.8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	18-49	64.1%	70.7%	62.9%	63.4%	57.1%
	50+	22.1%	29.3%	37.1%	36.6%	42.9%

(a) The state classifies Pacific Islander as Other.

## Sample Size

*Information is based on the number of returned forms and the number of people served according to DMH billing records.*


	Number Served April 2000	Number Forms Sent	Number Forms Returned	Percent of served Returned	Percent of Forms Returned
<b>CONSUMERS</b>					
Total State	24637		3815	15.5%	
Total Agency*	287		95	33.1%	
CPRC Adult	281		88	31.3%	
Non-CPRC Adult	19		7	36.8%	
<b>FAMILY MEMBERS</b>					
CPRC Adult		66	6		9.1%
*Unduplicated Count					

## Services for the Deaf or Hard of Hearing

The following represents the percentage of affirmative responses for each item. Item 1(a) "Do you use sign language?" reflects the percent of only those who are deaf or hard of hearing who use sign language. Item 1(b) "Did this agency have signing staff?" reflects the percentage of agencies that deaf or hard of hearing consumers identified as having signing staff available for those who use sign language.

	Overall Agency Totals		CPRC Adult Total		Non-CPRC Adult Total	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
Are you deaf or hard of hearing?	8.8%	6.7%	9.6%	6.0%	8.5%	16.7%
(a) If yes, do you use sign language?	11.0%	12.5%	12.0%	14.3%	8.5%	0%
(b) If yes, did this agency have signing staff?	29.0%	50.0%	33.6%	66.7%	19.0%	0%
Did this agency use interpreters?	6.5%	2.9%	8.0%	3.1%	4.5%	0%

# Overall Satisfaction with Services




*Program Satisfaction: Percent of responses to the question "How satisfied are you with the services you receive?"*

Some of the key findings were:

- Overall, 82% of the individuals served by the Comprehensive Psychiatric Services were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their services.
- The percent of individuals served by this agency who rated themselves as "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with services was higher than the state average (86.8% for this agency versus 82% for the state).
- The CPRC adult consumers rated the program higher than other program consumers (88.1% with at least a "satisfied" rating).

## Service Means Comparison of 1998, 1999 & 2000



### Comparison of 1998, 1999 & 2000 Mean Ratings

Some of the key findings were:

- The mean satisfaction with services rating for this agency was 4.39 in 1998, 4.53 in 1999 and 4.42 in 2000.
- The mean satisfaction with services rating has remained consistent each year.

## Satisfaction with Services

How satisfied are you . . .	Total Consumers		CPRC Adult		Non-CPRC Adult	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
with the staff who serve you?	4.32 (3674)	4.41 (94)	4.33 (2053)	4.44 (87)	4.36 (1350)	4.14 (7)
with how much your staff know about how to get things done?	4.20 (3614)	4.34 (93)	4.22 (2030)	4.37 (86)	4.22 (1319)	4.00 (7)
with how staff keep things about you and your life confidential?	4.36 (3595)	4.26 (93)	4.33 (2026)	4.29 (86)	4.43 (1307)	3.86 (7)
that your treatment plan has what you want in it?	4.19 (3583)	4.37 (91)	4.24 (2019)	4.36 (84)	4.16 (1306)	4.57 (7)
that your treatment plan is being followed by those who assist you?	4.24 (3561)	4.38 (91)	4.27 (2018)	4.42 (84)	4.24 (1283)	4.00 (7)
that the agency staff respect your ethnic and cultural background?	4.39 (3432)	4.49 (88)	4.37 (1934)	4.51 (81)	4.45 (1246)	4.29 (7)
with the services that you receive?	4.30 (3617)	4.42 (91)	4.32 (2023)	4.45 (84)	4.31 (1328)	4.00 (7)
that services are provided in a timely manner?	4.20 (3615)	4.34 (93)	4.24 (2026)	4.37 (86)	4.21 (1331)	4.00 (7)
The first number represents a mean rating. Scale: 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied. The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.						

### Some of the key findings were:

- The participants in the Comprehensive Psychiatric Services programs were satisfied with the services they received. All service ratings were above a 4.00 ("satisfied"). The ratings of this agency ranged from 4.26 to 4.49.
- The highest rated item at this agency was that the agency staff respect the consumers ethnic and cultural background (mean of 4.49).
- The lowest rated item was with how staff keep things about the consumer and the consumer's life confidential (mean of 4.26).
- The CPRC participants were the most satisfied with services (mean rating of 4.45).

# Satisfaction with Quality of Life

How satisfied are you . . .	Total Consumers		CPRC Adult		Non-CPRC Adult	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
With how you spend your day?	3.47 (3588)	3.71 (92)	3.58 (2024)	3.69 (85)	3.29 (1340)	3.86 (7)
With where you live?	3.65 (3583)	3.75 (92)	3.74 (2020)	3.75 (85)	3.54 (1338)	3.71 (7)
With the amount of choices you have in your life?	3.44 (3574)	3.64 (90)	3.57 (2022)	3.66 (83)	3.23 (1332)	3.43 (7)
With the opportunities/ chances you have to make friends?	3.53 (3570)	3.84 (93)	3.68 (2024)	3.85 (86)	3.29 (1322)	3.71 (7)
With your general health care?	3.70 (3564)	4.08 (92)	3.84 (2019)	4.11 (85)	3.44 (1324)	3.71 (7)
With what you do during your free time?	3.52 (3580)	3.70 (91)	3.66 (2020)	3.69 (84)	3.28 (1334)	3.86 (7)
How safe do you feel . . .						
in your home?	3.96 (3607)	3.88 (94)	3.95 (2041)	3.85 (87)	3.95 (1337)	4.29 (7)
in your neighborhood?	3.81 (3563)	3.73 (94)	3.82 (2008)	3.71 (87)	3.80 (1327)	4.00 (7)
The first number represents a mean rating. Scale: (how satisfied are you...): 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied. Scale: (how safe do you feel...): 1=Not at all safe . . . 5=Very safe. The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.						

## Some of the key findings were:

- The quality of life ratings were significantly below the ratings of Comprehensive Psychiatric Services and agency service ratings.
- The consumers were most satisfied with their general health care (mean of 4.08) and least satisfied with the amount of choices they have in their life (mean of 3.64).



# Satisfaction with Crisis Hotline

In the past year 24 (26.7%) consumers from this agency have called about a crisis after normal office hours.				
In the past year, about how many times have you called about a crisis after normal office hours?	1 time (a)	2-5 times	6-9 times	10+ times
	42.3 (11)	42.3 (11)	7.7 (2)	7.7 (2)
(a) The first number represents the percent who used crisis services for the specified period of time. The number in parenthesis represents the number responding to this choice.				

How satisfied are you . . .	Total Consumers		CPRC Adult		Non-CPRC Adult	
	State	Agency	State	Agency	State	Agency
That crisis staff responded promptly to your needs?	3.70 (890)	3.63 (24)	3.76 (537)	3.63 (24)	3.62 (326)	0 (0)
That crisis staff was courteous, friendly, and understanding?	3.94 (882)	3.64 (25)	3.93 (533)	3.67 (24)	3.95 (322)	3.00 (1)
With how much crisis staff know about how to get things done?	3.73 (874)	3.60 (25)	3.76 (531)	3.63 (24)	3.69 (316)	3.00 (1)
That you got the help you needed?	3.72 (878)	3.64 (25)	3.81 (531)	3.67 (24)	3.58 (320)	3.00 (1)
With the overall crisis services you received?	3.80 (881)	3.64 (25)	3.86 (531)	3.67 (24)	3.72 (323)	3.00 (1)
The first number represents a mean rating. Scale: (how satisfied are you...): 1=Not at all satisfied . . . 5=Very satisfied. The number in parentheses represents the number responding to this item.						

## Some of the key findings were:

- The agency crisis services (mean of 3.64) were rated slightly lower than the state crisis services (mean of 3.80).
- The lowest rated item was with how much crisis staff know about how to get things done (mean of 3.60).

## Previous Feedback

The last page of the survey offered people the opportunity to address any issues by writing in comments. These hand-written comments were copied and faxed back to your agency as they were received. The primary purposes for this action was to allow for immediate feedback from the people you serve, to give you the opportunity to make any necessary improvements, and to pass along compliments to your staff.

## Sampling Methodology

Consumer Satisfaction Forms were given to people served by ADA and CPS during April 2000. For MRDD, data was collected through interviews.

People who received services from more than one program or agency received more than one survey. Therefore, some people completed more than one survey.

While this method may not have achieved a sufficient sample size to represent the opinions of all people who receive services from each provider, the survey has provided people with an opportunity to express their opinions and concerns. Giving the majority of people who receive DMH services a quick and simple way to express opinions and concerns about service quality is a major aim of this process.

## Use of Data and Quality Improvement

The methods of data collection, the survey content and the survey results should all be considered in terms of quality improvement. The Missouri Department of Mental Health Satisfaction Survey has been designed as a quality improvement process, not as traditional mental health research.

There are two primary uses of this data. First, this data gives the Department of Mental Health an expression of the level of satisfaction of the people served by the Missouri DMH system as a whole.

Second, this data is designed to support quality improvement processes at the provider level. Each provider will have a basis upon which to compare the level of satisfaction of the people who receive services at their agency with other providers of their type and the state as a whole. This comparison makes it possible for each provider to improve the quality of the services they offer. In addition, each provider can get a clear idea of some of the issues that are important to the people they serve.

It is important to understand the context of services at each agency when interpreting the meaning of survey results. Differences in the population served at each agency, variations in service provision, and particular cultural characteristics of the community in which services take place must be taken into account as providers use this information to improve the quality of services. This report does not attempt to take into account these variations. As your agency engages in quality improvement, it is your responsibility to understand and take into account these local variations in order to make the most of the information contained within this report.

*Please forward any suggestions for improvement of the survey process to Gary Harbison, Outcomes, Missouri Department of Mental Health, PO Box 687, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. Additional information about survey results may be obtained by contacting Christine Rinck, Ph.D., University of Missouri-Kansas City Institute for Human Development, 2220 Holmes, 3rd Floor, Kansas City, Missouri 64108.*